

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated May 10, 2006, the Examiner 1) rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7-10, 13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted Prior Art; and 2) rejected claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Deibert* (U.S. Patent 4,336,728) in view of either *Rozmus* (U.S. Patent 3,490,317) or *Kress* (U.S. Patent 1,957,462). In responding to the rejections below, Applicant makes arguments addressed to specific claims. Applicant's arguments are intended to be limited to the claims to which they are addressed. Such arguments are not intended to apply to similar language in other claims not expressly addressed by the arguments.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7-10, 13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art and rejected claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Deibert* in view of either *Rozmus* or *Kress*. Based on the Examiner's comments following the stated grounds of rejection of claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicant assumes that the Examiner mistakenly cited *Deibert* as part of the grounds for rejection of claims 6 and 14 under § 103 instead of Applicant's admitted prior art. Under this assumption, Applicant will address the Examiner's rejection of claims 6 and 14 under § 103(a) based on Applicant's admitted prior art in view of either *Rozmus* or *Kress*.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches a biasing mechanism featuring a pin on one end and a spring element on the opposed end. The pin and spring element are connected and oriented essentially perpendicular to each other. The pin is inserted into a through-hole of a pawl, and thereby connected with the pawl, while the spring element is inserted into a receptacle located within a switch member. When the switch member is actuated in the invention described in Applicant's admitted prior art, the pin acts on the through-hole of the pawl, causing the pawl to move in the direction of the pin. The through-hole of the pawl does not appear to have a first wall portion and a second wall portion. Additionally, because the pin and pawl are connected at the through-hole such that the pin is completely constrained by the through-hole, the pin does not bear in alternating fashion on opposed sides of the through-hole. The pin simply bears on the through-hole in its entirety, and does not alternate the fashion in which the motion of the pin is translated to the pawl.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to clarify that the wall defining the recess of the sliding pawl has two spaced wall portions for alternate bearing by the biasing means (claim 1) or the first end of the elongate member (claim 9).

More specifically, amended claim 1 now contains limitations relating to the biasing means and the sliding pawl, and specifically requires that the biasing means bear on either a first wall portion or a second wall portion of a wall defining the recess of the sliding pawl. Namely, the motion of the sliding pawl is accomplished in reaction to the biasing means bearing on either the first wall portion or second wall portion of the wall defining the recess of the sliding pawl. None of Applicant's admitted prior art, *Deibert*, *Rozmus*, or *Kress* teach the alternate bearing of the biasing means on the first wall portion and second wall portion of the wall defining the recess defining the recess of the sliding pawl as is claimed in the amended claim 1.

Meanwhile, amended claim 9 now contains limitations relating to the interplay between the first end of the elongate member and the sliding pawl, and specifically requires that as the switch member and the elongate member rotate the first end of the elongate member alternates in bearing on a first wall portion and second wall portion of a wall defining the recess of the sliding pawl. Namely, the motion of the sliding pawl is accomplished in reaction to the first end of the elongate member bearing on either the first wall portion or second wall portion of the wall defining the recess of the sliding pawl. None of Applicant's admitted prior art, *Deibert*, *Rozmus*, or *Kress* teach the alternate bearing of the first end of the elongate member on the first wall portion and second wall portion of the wall defining the recess of the sliding pawl as is claimed in the amended claim 9.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the recess of the sliding pawl recited in amended claims 1 and 9 faces the receptacle of the actuating plate whereas the recess in Applicant's admitted prior art is defined in a top face of the pawl instead of facing the receptacle of the actuating plate.

New claims 17 and 18 recite that the wall defining the recess includes a third wall portion intermediate the first wall portion and the second wall portion, wherein a distance between the third wall portion and a center of the recess is smaller than that between the center of the recess and each of the first wall portion and the second wall portion, which is not shown or disclosed by Applicant's admitted prior art, *Rozmus*, or *Kress*.

Further, the interplay of the elongate member and sliding pawl, in combination with the sliding nature of the pawl in the present invention, differentiate the present invention from the devices taught in the cited prior art references. The incorporation of a sliding pawl in the present

invention allows for the use of a single pawl recess, as opposed to the at least two pawl recesses taught in *Kress*, and provides the configuration for the first end of the elongate member to bear in alternating fashion on two spaced wall portions of the wall defining the pawl recess as the elongate member rotates.

As none of the references cited by the Examiner teach a biasing means or a first end of the elongate member alternates in bearing on two spaced wall portions of the wall defining a sliding pawl recess, the combination of the cited references can not render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1 and 9 as amended are in allowable form.

As discussed above none of Applicant's admitted prior art, *Deibert*, *Rozmus*, or *Kress* teach the alternate bearing of a biasing means or a first end of the elongate member on two spaced wall portions of the wall defining the recess of a sliding pawl as is claimed in the amended claims. Therefore, the claims as amended are not anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art or obvious over a combination of *Deibert* and *Rozmus* or *Kress*.

Conclusion

Allowance of claims 1, 5-9 and 14-18 is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview would be beneficial, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Derek V. Forinash
Reg. No. 47,231
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P.O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
(713) 238-8000 (Tel.)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT